



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Works of Thomas Kyd, Edited from the Original Texts with Introduction, Notes, and Facsimiles, by FREDERICK S. BOAS, M. A., Balliol College, Oxford; Professor of History and English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast: Author of 'Shakspeare and His Predecessors', etc. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, H. Frowde, 1901. Pp. cxvi, 470.)

It seems rather remarkable that, notwithstanding the interest that has been taken in Kyd during the past twenty odd years, a complete and authoritative edition of his works should not be published till the year just closed. We can congratulate ourselves, however, that if we have waited long, we have been rewarded by having in Prof. Boas's edition a scholarly piece of work. All the early quartos of Kyd's plays and pamphlets have been collated and the later editions have been consulted for their variations from the early texts. In each case the editor has fixed upon the text which as a whole preserves the best reading and he has varied from it only in cases where another quarto has undoubtedly a better reading or where all the quartos are manifestly corrupt. For the 'Spanish Tragedy' he has followed the text of the undated "Allde" Quarto, which is generally believed to be the earliest issue extant, and has collated with this the other nine quartos, besides noting the significant variations in the collections of Dodsley, Hawkins, Reed, and Collier, in Fleischer's 'Bemerkungen ü. T. Kyd's Sp. Tr.', and in Schick's edition of the 'Spanish Tragedy.' Manly's text in his 'Specimens of the Pre-Shakspearean Drama' does not seem to have been consulted. Boas's text of the 'Spanish Tragedy' varies only slightly from Schick's—and then usually for the better. He follows the wise plan of keeping as near his original as possible, and by so doing avoids the astounding emendations of earlier editors. He is careful to give credit where due to his predecessors—indeed, I have noted only two cases where in the establishment of the text credit is not properly assigned. In the 'Spanish Tragedy' II. i. 29, Schick, instead of Fleischer, is credited with changing the Qq. reading "these extasies" to "this extasie", and so restoring the rime; and in the same play, III. iv. 56, he fails to note that Fleischer was the first to give a very evident interpretation to the line—

To stand good L and help him in distress—

by making 'L' equal 'Lord' and not 'Lorenzo'—as had been done by the early editors.

Manly's text of the 'Spanish Tragedy' gives the misprints of the "Alde" Quarto, which Boas disregards. Among these Manly notes 'diadome' (I. iii. 83), which Boas prints as a correct spelling; he remarks on the omission of 'Lor.' before Lorenzo's speech (III. xiv. 128), which Boas silently supplies. Of II. i. 126-7—

Which sweet conceits are lim'de with slie deceits,
Which slie deceits smooth Bel-imperia eares,

Manly says the 1633 Q. omits 'are lim'de with slie deceits, Which slie deceits'; Boas says Qq. 1615-18-23-33 omit l. 126, and have in l. 127 'sweete conceits' for 'slie deceits.' Other places of disagreement in their collations are I. ii. 38, 'ordinance', 83 'waving'; II. i. 16 'Marses'; II. v. 22 'these'; III. xi. 9 'at *the* nine months'. Let those who have access to the original texts decide who is right. In III. xiv. 105 Boas is surely correct in following the Qq. and reading 'Truce,' which Manly emends to 'True.' Balthasar and Bel-imperia were engaged in a thrust and parry dialogue, when the heroine sees her father, and says 'I see my lord, my father,' and Balthasar replies 'Truce, my love, I will go salute him'.

Even if, as Schick says, we are not warranted in calling Kyd with Klein 'den unpersönlichsten aller Dichter', we yet know comparatively little of his life. There are twenty-three years, from 1565 to 1588, which can be filled in only inferentially, and for these Boas has said about all that prudent inference will allow. Nash's invective in his Preface to Greene's 'Menaphon' and the evidences of learning in Kyd's works are the data on which Boas furnishes forth these years in which biography is a blank. We can hardly take exception to the hypothesis that Kyd is the object of Nash's invective. There is no other person whom the cap fits so well as Kyd. Prof. M. W. McCallum¹ argues the case for Shakspeare 'without more casuistry than is considered lawful among literary critics', but this, the strongest case put forth for any one besides Kyd, falls through on the author's admission that he cannot identify Shakspeare with those who 'intermeddle with Italian translations: wherein how poorelie they haue plodded . . . let all indifferent gentlemen that haue trauailed in that tongue discern by their two penie pamphlets: and no meruaile though their home-born mediocritie be such in this matter'. And there are more reasons than this, which here it is not necessary to bring out, for refusing to Shakspeare the doubtful honour of Nash's hatred. Nor do McCallum's arguments weaken Kyd's claims to any appreciable extent.

¹ "The authorship of the Early Hamlet," in *An English Miscellany* presented to Dr. Furnivall.

With Markscheffel,¹ Sarrazin,² and Schick,³ Boas holds to the view that the 'Spanish Tragedy' was written before the Armada. The arguments brought forward by Schröer,⁴ Brandl,⁵ and Bang⁶ seem wholly inconclusive. It seems incredible that, if the play had been written in 1589 or 1590, Kyd should be satisfied to refer to English victories as far back as those of John of Gaunt or that an English audience should see in these obscure events allusions to recent glorious victories. The exact date cannot be fixed by any evidence at present available, but Boas cannot be far wrong in making 1585-7 the period within which the play was written. To assume an earlier date, as Schick ventures, would, I think, be shut out by the fact that there is a passage in the play (I. ii. 22 f.) which is strongly imitative of the messenger's account of the battle of Thapsus in Garnier's 'Cornelie' act v.; it was in 1585 that the collected edition of Garnier's works was published. To assume with Sarrazin that this is a later addition, inserted when Kyd was at work on his translation of 'Cornelie,' seems wholly unnecessary.

In his discussion of the authorship of 'Jeronimo' Boas enters upon the troublesome problem of the establishment of the Kyd canon. We know positively from external evidence that only the 'Spanish Tragedy' and the translation 'Cornelia' are by Kyd; we have no such evidence for 'Jeronimo' or 'Soliman and Perseda.' Our only evidence is internal. Markscheffel,⁷ Sarrazin,⁸ and Koepfel⁹ favour the view that 'Jeronimo' is an early work of Kyd's, while Schröer¹⁰ and Fischer¹¹ emphatically deny it. It would be greatly to Kyd's credit if the burden of this play could be removed from his shoulders, but that the evidence adduced by Boas exonerates him is doubtful. We know from Henslowe's 'Diary' that there was a play in the nature of a more or less comic introduction to the 'Spanish Tragedy.' Markscheffel's contention need not follow that since the 'Spanish Tragedy' referred to a fore-piece, 'Jeronimo' must have been written before the 'Spanish Tragedy.' The references do not necessarily identify 'Jeronimo' with the fore-piece. Further the 'Diary' shows that this play had a short and feeble stage-life and that it is not mentioned after 1592. That it should be resurrected about 1600 and printed in 1605 is not improbable when regard is had to the history of the plays of this period. (Compare the publication of the 'Famous Victories of Henry V' and of 'King Leir.') That the

¹ Th. Kyd's Tragödien, p. 6 f.

² Kyd u. Sein Kreis, p. 50 f.

³ Ed. of Sp. Tr. p. xxi f.

⁴ Über Titus Andronicus (only accessible to me in the reviews).

⁵ Gott. Gel. Anz. 1891, p. 725.

⁶ Eng. Stud. XXVIII, p. 229 f.

⁷ Kyd's Trag., p. 13 f.

⁸ Kyd &c., p. 54 f.

⁹ Eng. Stud. XVIII, 125 f.

¹⁰ Op. cit.

¹¹ Zur Kunstentwicklung d. Eng. Tragödie, p. 100 f.

'First Part' was acted by the Children of the Chapel is manifest from the references to the size of the hero in the play itself; these references would hardly be suggested by the Children's performance of the 'Spanish Tragedy', as Boas maintains. According to the Induction to Marston's 'Malcontent' the Children misappropriated Kyd's play, which, as follows from the argument just adduced, must be the 'First Part', and in revenge the King's company acted the 'Malcontent.' His conclusion, now, Boas seeks to support by purely internal tests. Thus in the matter of characterization there are fundamental differences. The characters of Bel-imperia, Lorenzo, Balthasar, and, most of all, of Hieronimo vary beyond reconciliation in the two plays. Sarrazin's endeavour to account for the change from the buffoon Jeronimo in the fore-piece to the tragic figure of Hieronimo in the 'Spanish Tragedy' as developmental surely fails. The resemblances between the two plays of which Markscheffel made so much are mostly conventional and accidental. On the other hand, there are inconsistencies between the fore-piece and the main play which, both Fischer and Boas maintain, are much more like the botching of a clumsy imitator than the forgetfulness or indifference of an author in regard to his earlier work. These differences and inconsistencies may be partly accounted for by the alterations made in adapting the play for the Children. Again, we need not assume that Kyd's intentions in the 'First Part' were the same as in the 'Spanish Tragedy.'

The presumptive evidence in favour of Kyd's authorship of 'Soliman and Perseda' is only this, that the story was used by him as the subject of the inner play in the 'Spanish Tragedy,' and that, as he first made use of a bit of description in Garnier's 'Cornelie' for his 'Spanish Tragedy' and later translated the whole play, so here he may have used Wotton's story as the subject of a complete tragedy, which before had furnished forth but a dramatic incident. The same ground for supposing an anonymous imitator to be the author does not exist as in the case of 'Jeronimo,' since Kyd's reputation was not so great nor the 'Spanish Tragedy' so famous in 1588-9 as in 1602-5. Unfortunately we have no source for the 'Spanish Tragedy,' and are therefore unable to compare the treatment of the original in that play with the handling of the source in 'Soliman and Perseda.' We are thus shut off from what would most probably be a satisfactory means of determining Kyd's authorship. About all that is left to us is a consideration of the original matter in the play. And it is principally on this that Boas bases his argument in favour of Kyd's authorship. A mere imitator of Kyd—and I cannot see why the author of this play should feel any need of imitating Kyd—would not likely imitate him in details more or less inconsequent to the action. So Boas does well in calling attention to 'Soliman and Perseda' I. iii., where the Prince of Cipris questions the knights about their exploits and mottoes and

they reply, as parallel to 'Spanish Tragedy' I. v., where the king questions Hieronimo concerning the knights and their scutcheons in the masque. Still more striking, as pointing to common authorship, is the scene (I. v.) where "Soliman is introduced with his two brothers Amurath and Haleb, of whom the former kills the latter as a traitor for protesting against an attack on Rhodes and is slain in retribution by Soliman himself". This is parallel to just as inconsequent a scene in the 'Spanish Tragedy' (I. iii.) where the "Viceroy appears between two lords, one of whom by a charge of treachery nearly brings the other to his doom". Further, as Boas points out, these scenes preserve a balance of location, in one case between Spain and Portugal, in the other between Rhodes and Constantinople. The mingling of the serious and the comic, which is not found in the novel, is in the manner of Kyd, as shown in the 'hangman' scenes in the 'Spanish Tragedy,' and certainly should not be used as an argument against his authorship. The highly comic character of Basilisco is a dramatic type with which Kyd must have been familiar. Indeed such scenes as these justify Ben Jonson's punning allusion to 'Sporting Kyd'. Some of Boas's other parallels are not so convincing, since in the case of 'Soliman and Perseda' the paralleled incidents are taken directly from the novel. The unnatural wavering of Soliman, which has been objected to as not in Kyd's manner, is also found in the source. The cheating of Lucina by Perseda by means of false dice is strikingly like the cheating of Pedringano with the false pardon, and is the author's own invention. The unfortunate means by which Perseda kills Soliman are not more melodramatic than Hieronimo's conduct in the close of the 'Spanish Tragedy.' We cannot venture beyond probabilities in this question, but these are in favour of Kyd's authorship.

The most convincing evidence we have of Kyd's authorship of the 'Ur-Hamlet' is in Nash's Preface, which we may almost with certainty regard as directed against Kyd; here Nash says—"and if you intreate him faire in a frostie morning, he will afford you whole *Hamlets*, I should say handfulls of tragical speeches.' If it were proved beyond a doubt that Nash was attacking some one else, I do not believe that the internal evidence, brought forward by Boas and others, would establish Kyd's authorship. However, so long as this external evidence points to his authorship, it is worth while to examine the corroborative internal evidence. The evidence consists of resemblances in technique and diction. Just as in 'Soliman and Perseda' there were variations from its source, so the 1603 Quarto of 'Hamlet,' which is our nearest approach to the 'Ur Hamlet', shows marked variations from its ultimate source in Belleforest's novel. And in 'Hamlet' the variations are more after Kyd's manner than those in 'Soliman and Perseda.' As Boas points out, we have a tripartite plot—personal revenge, political intrigue, and love romance—in the

'Spanish Tragedy' and in 'Hamlet.' The love element is barely suggested by Belleforest. The tripartite plot is also found in 'Soliman and Perseda.' In the 'Spanish Tragedy' and in 'Soliman and Perseda' Kyd is concerned to fix our attention on two separate scenes of action—Spain and Portugal, Constantinople and Rhodes; so in Hamlet, but not in the novel, ambassadors pass between Denmark and Norway. Ophelia's brother Leartes is parallel to Bel-imperia's Lorenzo, and in both cases the brothers clash with the lovers with death as the consequence. Again, the madness of Ophelia touches closely her lover Hamlet, and the madness of Isabella affects most deeply her husband Hieronimo. And this matter dealing with Ophelia is the dramatist's own. The play scene as a means in the working out of the hero's revenge is an important factor in the 'Spanish Tragedy' and 'Hamlet,' and is also no part of Belleforest. It is in these broad lines where the play departs from the novel that the traces of Kyd are of some importance, and not in the more insignificant resemblances between the two plays, which Boas also adduces. Thus very little weight should be attached to the fact that Leartes and Lorenzo had both been in Paris.

If now the 1603 Quarto is a reworking of the 'Ur-Hamlet,' we should expect with Boas to find in it certain traces of Kyd's diction. The last three acts, our editor is convinced, are "almost entirely pre-Shakspearean", and he brings forward some three pages of parallels between the 1603 Quarto and the known works of Kyd. These parallels are correspondent in phrasing and are evidently reminiscent of the earlier play—whether conscious or unconscious, it matters little. For that very reason we are not justified in regarding them with Boas as "practically irresistible internal tests" of Kyd's authorship of the 'Ur-Hamlet.' Standing alone they are just as good evidence of imitation of Kyd's phrases as of his common authorship of these plays. In fact Sarrazin¹ points out parallels between 'Soliman and Perseda' and 'Hamlet,' Q. 1604, which we refuse to admit as proving a common authorship of these passages or as indicating that the passages in the 1604 Quarto, which, too, are not in the 1603 Quarto, are a survival from the 'Ur-Hamlet.' Moreover Boas himself in discussing the relation of 'Titus Andronicus' to Kyd disregards correspondence in phrase and dramatic technique with his known works as of sufficient weight to be a test of common authorship.

Further when Boas finds evidence of Kyd's hand in the fact that there is a marked objection to second marriages in the "inner play" of the 1603 Quarto, in 'Cornelia,' and in the 'Householder's Philosophy,' and infers, from there not being any such objection in Shakspeare's authenticated works, that the passage in the 1603 Quarto is a survival from the 'Ur-Hamlet' and is the

¹ Kyd &c., p. 106 f.

expression of Kyd's personal opinion, we cannot admit it as having weight. There is in the "inner play" a special reason for the duchess to express her abhorrence of second marriages. I have not the originals of Kyd's translations and cannot say whether he was gratuitously inserting in the works mentioned an expression of his personal disapproval of second marriages or not.

The last three sections of Boas's Introduction treat of Kyd's translations and last years, his influence and reputation, and the modern editions of his works.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

JAMES W. TUPPER.